



November 3, 2020

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

From: Liz Thorstenson, Campus Planning
Campus Planning and Facilities Management (CPFM)

Subject: **Record** of the October 20, 2020 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Ken Kato (chair), George Evans, Hilary Gerdes, Michael Griffel, Michael Harwood, Shawn Kahl, Dean Livelybrooks, Terry McQuilkin, Cathy Soutar, Christine Thompson, Laurie Woodward

CPC Staff: Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning)

Guests: Craig Ashford (General Counsel), Jane Brubaker (CPFM), Emily Eng (Campus Planning), Allen Hancock (Community Member), Brent Harrison (PE & Rec), Lynn Nester (PE & Rec), Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning), Matt Roberts (University Advancement), Bitty Roy (Biology), Josh Skov (COB), Philip Speranza (Architecture)

CPC Agenda

Announcements:

- The 2020-2021 CPC committee begins October 30, 2020.
- There will be a public hearing regarding this agenda item on November 10, 2020.

1. Campus Plan Amendment: North of Franklin Boulevard – Continuation of Preliminary Proposal Review

Background: CPC staff introduced the purpose of the agenda item as described in the meeting mailing and the relevant key *Campus Plan* principles and applicable patterns to the project.

Campus Planning Senior Planner, Emily Eng, presented the preliminary proposed density amendments including specific items that will be in the amendment regarding densities, and paused for questions and comments after the presentation. Campus Planning staff, Aaron Olsen, presented additional information regarding the Urban Farm and

Willamette and Millrace Design Areas, and paused for questions and comments after the presentation.

Campus Plan Densities: Willamette and Millrace Design Areas

Discussion: The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members:

- There is support for the Willamette Design Area being lower density.
- Development that impacts a campus building or open space would be required to replace the displaced use.
- This process is designed to carefully consider densities, yet remain unspecific about exact footprints. We are committed to the open spaces to drive where future footprints are located and what uses they ultimately serve.
- Regarding density calculations, should we omit the open spaces?
- Development is greatly affected by quality and interactions with the ground plane and people. Open space matters. Therefore, Design Area densities purposely encompass the entire zone (both the developable and non-developable area) because it gives a sense of what the future character of that area will be, instead of parsing out just the development site. For example, a development site with a very high density and no open space next to it is very different than development with a large area of open space.
- Regarding the Willamette design area, is there consideration about future building uses and how the 4% was calculated? There is appreciation for this area being low density.
- The buildings shown on the plan are theoretical. Nothing precludes buildings at a different location or configuration; however density will not increase.
- Regarding parking considerations, these parameters would be addressed for a project when it comes forward.
- The final draft proposal will not show building footprints. Defining possible building footprints was used as an internal campus planning tool.
- Density sub-areas can be included; however, the amendment is the actual Design Area densities. The Willamette Design Area is well defined by the CUP.

The following is a summary of questions and comments from guests:

- There is support for defining FAR densities.

- Are the one-story COD buildings being replaced with higher density buildings? Consider representing different density heights shown on the map by using different colors for readability.
- Is building height density being considered for the future? Planned density is the best way of maintaining open space.
- What is the existing FAR compared to the proposed FAR?
- Does the number of stories come from the maximum-allowed density calculation? How does the design principle of a 4-story maximum manifest here?
- The Millrace Design Area's proposed FAR results in 3-5 stories.
- If every design area is a weighted average, why is the Millrace not a separate area? If there is no intention of building on the Millrace, consider how that affects densities.
- The site map looks designed and with articulation. Consider how the public will read this map if these are just placeholder buildings.
- Regarding the area west of the Millrace outfall, if it is completely built out to the densities allowed in the CUP (including parking needed for the area, according to city code), there is not enough land to also comply with the Eugene Transportation System Plan, which identifies a pedestrian / bike underpass. The Campus Plan amendment should acknowledge that the CUP proposal is not possible.
- Are density sub-areas defined yet for this area?
- Has the 4% density shown for the Willamette Design Area considered the need for equipment and maintenance storage, restrooms, and utilities for recreation purposes?
- In the *Campus Plan*, it makes sense to show the area outside the designated open space (in yellow) north of the tracks as a potentially buildable area with no structures. Consider leaving plans open to show all potential rather than filled in with possibilities.

In response to questions and comments from committee members and guests, Eng and Olsen provided the following clarifications:

- The buildings shown on the map are existing buildings that are unlikely to change. The new buildings shown on the map are examples based on the Framework Vision Project (FVP) and proposed open space framework. These building examples are 3-5 stories.

- Consider that the North Campus Design Area currently has a maximum allowed 30% coverage. The existing low density development equals 16% coverage. The existing FAR is .4.
- The Millrace and other designated open spaces are included in the density calculation. No buildings are allowed within any of the designated open space areas shown on the plan. The *Campus Plan* has sub-areas, and within those sub-areas there are desired maximums, which are not an absolute number, but a suggestion for what is suitable. We cannot fill up a sub-area entirely with buildings. If the Millrace and other designated open spaces are removed, the density numbers would increase.
- During the CUP process, opportunities for locating a limited number of buildings near the river were evaluated. The design team assessed appropriate scale for buildings to minimize impact on open spaces. No programming for the buildings were defined however research, accessory, academic, and small scale type development would match the proposed sizes.
- Existing campus building footprints were used to test the scale of buildings - the buildings have not been designed. *Campus Plan* Principle 12 will inform possible future uses for those buildings.
- This proposed amendment will not show building footprints, just densities, and no decisions have been made regarding types of buildings.
- If there was a project west of the Millrace outfall, the project would need to meet all city requirements. This may not result in reaching the maximum allowed density.
- The final documents describing the proposed amendment will not show theoretical footprints in the actual *Campus Plan* diagrams.
- The intent is to create sub-areas for the *Campus Plan* densities table on pages 37-38.
- The CUP locked in maximum allowed density at 4% for the Willamette Design Area, which would meet the needs of any potential recreational uses, including an accessory building for recreation fields.

Campus Plan Amendment: Willamette and Millrace Design Areas

Discussion: The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members:

- Consider modifying the language on page 22 of the proposed amendment text and the map of the Willamette Design Area. There is concern that the language is too specific and should remain more general. *Note from CPC staff: New language was proposed and read by the member. Proposed text will be emailed to Campus Planning staff.*
- Consider removing the outlines of potential recreation fields from the map.
- There is support for removal of possible future recreation field outlines.
- Continue to show the recreation fields that are in existing use.
- When showing existing or proposed buildings and open spaces, be consistent in what is shown on the map.
- It is important that the committee hears all perspectives. If there's a universal goal to support the proposed modified language, then it would be important to carefully explore how to adjust the language so that it is consistent with the *Campus Plan*. For example, referencing specific language related to Senate motions is likely not needed.
- There is support for not changing the longer version of the member's proposed text and to leave the text as is.
- Are additional recreation fields still needed?
- This committee has done a lot of really good work over the last few years. There is support for simplifying the map and not becoming too specific.
- There is support for showing what exists now as a base map document.
- A suggestion for creating three types of maps for the Willamette Design Area was made, including: a.) all buildings built (shown as rectangles), b.) all of the area as a Natural Area, c.) recreation fields as per the CUP. None of each of these maps would include other elements (e.g., no buildings shown on options b.) or c.).
- Regarding recreation field capacity, prior to the start of the Hayward Field project, the university was short on fields. Post Hayward Field construction, the fields were not restored to the same size. The recreation fields are not regulation size for many sports.
- A suggestion was made to reconfigure the existing field layouts and adjacent Athletics uses to create space for a large field.
- Are the existing riverfront fields maintained to the level they were five years ago? They should be maintained so people are happy playing there. It is a good field and it drains well.

- The definition of need and space use, from buildings to outdoor classrooms, is not the role of the CPC. The role of CPC regarding this proposal is to identify potential spaces to accommodate those needs in the future.

The following is a summary of questions and comments from guests:

- Based on increased enrollment, recreation fields are needed. Additionally, there are current recreation field needs that are not being met by the existing fields.
- Resources and money are needed to change the layouts of the recreation fields. Regarding the existing riverfront field maintenance, it could be greatly improved and there is a goal to do so.

In response to questions and comments from committee members and guests Olsen provided the following clarifications:

- There is support for removing the possible future recreation field outline on the amendment map. The existing field will still be shown on the diagram.
- While there is an endless number of outcomes that could be drawn on a plan, the goal is to set up a framework and establishing priorities for the future to be able to solve those design problems and space needs. Items added today will be a point of conversation for future projects. Nothing is on the table right now for a specific project.

Urban Farm

Discussion: The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members:

- As future potential development near the Urban Farm is assessed, the possibility of blocking the Urban Farm's solar access should be considered. For example, a 4-story building located immediately east of the urban farm could have direct impact.
- Sunlight is a major factor for the Urban Farm. Carefully consider the location of the urban farm in response to those needs.
- It is helpful to think about options to expand the Urban Farm into other campus locations. For example, the Urban Farm has effectively expanded into the East Campus Design Area. The area north of the tracks might be another possible location for the Urban Farm, given that it would have good access to sunlight and the could serve as a good transition use.

- The Urban Farm experience is memorable, cherished, and a good recruitment tool for UO. It helps highlight the COD urban agriculture and Landscape Architecture program.
- The proposed new language regarding the Urban Farm is flexible and appropriate, and there is support for the wording.
- The outdoor teaching space identified is important to preserve, while leaving an opportunity area north of the railroad tracks. The Urban Farm as a program is important to UO.
- Impacts on Urban Farm were looked at during adjacent new development.
- Thanks to Harper Keeler for bringing the importance of this program forward.

The following is a summary of questions and comments from guests:

- Regarding the concept of showing current uses on maps, showing the trees that are there now instead of hypothetical buildings makes sense. A huge number of students go through the Urban Farm program.
- In the past, an orchard has been mentioned as being a potential use along and near the north side of the railroad tracks. Harper was the one who suggested an orchard north along the railroad tracks.
- Cherished university experiences translates to future donors. The Urban Farm can be an important part in sustaining the financial future of the UO.
- Landscape Architecture alumni have noted that the Urban Farm was one of their most cherished experiences at UO. Thank you for presenting the history.
- The current location of the Urban Farm is integrated, and creates an anchor at the current location. There is support for integrating the two (nature and humans), instead of separating.
- Will walking distance be a problem for relocating the urban farm north?
- Is the solar setback from the Knight Campus now an issue?
- There is support for the current location of the urban farm.
- The solar setback from Knight Campus impacts the Urban Farm mainly in the winter (the Urban Farm grows some crops in winter).

In response to questions and comments from committee members and guests, Olsen provided the following clarifications:

- There are opportunities to showcase urban agriculture in the amendment wording. This may be a great setting and function for the Willamette Design Area, which might solve future Urban Farm needs.

- Students and volunteers have worked the Urban Farm land and soil for decades and there is a strong connection to the land.
- The goal is to look at how all suggestions come together in the proposal to meet all campus needs.
- The proposal language supports preserving Urban Farm function in this area, and preserves the actual outdoor classroom
- The Knight Campus Phase I project completed a solar study, and the impacts were considered.
- The future boundaries of the proposed designated open spaces considered how to integrate the Urban Farm.
- Campus Planning staff will follow-up with Harper Keeler regarding the Urban Farm (because he was unable to be in attendance).
- There are multiple changes happening in north campus - many locations and programs will be impacted. These impacts will be considered and addressed as projects come forward.

Action: No formal action was requested.